

Cedar Disability Awareness/Action Team (CDA/AT)

HISTORY:

Established April 2000

Appointed by Mayor Harold Shirley

Liason with City Council member

MISSION STATEMENT

The Cedar Disabilities Awareness/Action Team is committed to making Cedar City a fully accessible community for its residents and many visitors through ongoing improvements in public access. In addition, we encourage citizens' understanding for the physically and mentally challenged community through ongoing education programs.

PROJECTS:

- . Automated doors: U.S. Post Office (completed 2003)
- .Automated doors/ramps/ADA compliant bathrooms: local businesses and churches (ongoing)
- .Safety crossing flags: Main Street crosswalk – then replaced with signal
- .CATS Bus and Dial-A-Ride public transit systems (completed 2003)
- .Curb cuts for business and residential streets (ongoing)
- .Handicapped Parking: business cooperation for adequate and conveniently located parking stalls. Ongoing monitoring of appropriate parking practices.
- .Educational Seminars: (held at Public Library/presentations to High School Health classes) – Subjects have included Visual and Hearing Impairments, Schizophrenia, and Eating Disorders.
- .July Jamboree: Annual booth participation for the purpose of information/education for citizens (public input opportunity)
- .Snow Removal: public acknowledgement of businesses with exemplary removal in a timely manner



AMERICAN
KENNEL CLUBSM

May 3, 2016

The Honorable Maile Wilson
Mayor, City of Cedar City
10 North Main Street
Cedar City, UT 84720

Dear Madam Mayor:

Dog owners in Cedar City recently contacted the American Kennel Club (AKC) regarding a proposed ordinance that dramatically affects their ability to own dogs. We respectfully write to you on their behalf.

We understand that the Cedar City Council will soon consider legislation to increase the number of pets residents may own. While the AKC appreciates and supports the effort to increase the pet limit, we do not think it is necessary to restrict residents to owning dogs registered with AKC, or to restrict pet ownership numerically. Many responsible owners may also choose to own rescues, mixed breed or dogs that are not eligible for registration. It is also unclear what the policy would be if only some of the dogs owned by a resident are AKC registered.

The AKC disagrees with the policy of limiting animal ownership. **Not only are limit laws easily evaded and difficult to enforce, they fail to address the heart of animal control problems—irresponsible ownership.** Effective implementation of leash and curbing laws prevent pet owners from allowing their animals to run loose, while reasonable clean-up and noise ordinances require owners to take responsibility for their pets. I am attaching an informational flyer on this issue for your review.

The AKC strongly supports the humane treatment of dogs, including providing an adequate and nutritious diet, clean living conditions, regular veterinary care, kind and responsive human companionship and training in appropriate behavior. The American Kennel Club believes that all owners should be held to objective standards of care that are clearly defined in the law. We would be happy to provide sample nuisance laws that address this issue and have worked in other communities.

The AKC and your constituent dog owners would be pleased to assist you in developing reasonable regulations designed to ensure dogs and their owners remain respected members of our community. We invite you to take advantage of our public education programs, and we respectfully urge you consider alternatives to continuing to limit pet ownership. Please do not hesitate to contact us at (919) 816-3920 if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Sarah Sprouse
Legislative Analyst, Government Relations

cc: Members of the Cedar City Council

Animal Limit Laws: Better Alternatives

Why Limit Laws Don't Work

When animal control concerns arise, legislators often look to limit laws as a quick fix. In reality, limit laws cause more problems than they solve. Here is why:

- Limit laws do not address the heart of the problem, which is irresponsible dog ownership.
- There is no link between a specific number of dogs and nuisance problems. One dog that barks or runs loose will cause trouble, while several dogs that are quiet and stay home will not.
- Limit laws are extremely difficult to enforce and can be evaded by irresponsible animal owners.
- Limit laws may result in a decrease in the number of dogs licensed, since individuals may choose not to license their pets as a way to avoid giving up a beloved pet. Animal control officers therefore have no way of knowing how many pets an owner has unless they make regular door-to-door inspections, an expensive and time-consuming process that in many cases would require a search warrant. A drop in licensing would also severely impact a community's animal control budget.
- Hoping to evade limit laws, pet owners may try to hide the number of dogs they own. To do so, owners avoid taking their animal to veterinarians and getting needed vaccinations. This not only jeopardizes public health, but also affects rabies prevention and threatens public safety.
- People who are forced to give up their dogs due to limit laws usually relinquish them to local shelters, creating additional financial and emotional burdens for animal control and shelter officials.
- Limit laws would impact those who rescue unwanted animals and either adopt them or find them permanent homes.
- Limit laws target all owners, regardless of their actions or the behavior of their animals. Responsible owners should be allowed to use their own discretion in determining the number of dogs they can keep on their own property.



Better Solutions Include:

- Vigorous enforcement of animal control and nuisance regulations, that often already exist, designed to keep communities safe and enjoyable for everyone.
- Effective leash and clean up laws prevent irresponsible owners from letting their pets run loose, possibly endangering the public and other animals.
- Public education campaigns to teach residents about responsible dog ownership, such as how to properly care for and interact with pets.
- Use of an arbitrator to mediate neighborhood animal disputes would help settle personal arguments that are not indicative of an animal control problem.
- Alternative sentencing for nuisance law violators, including participation in obedience training classes or community service at an animal shelter.



AKC® Government Relations Department
8051 Arco Corporate Drive, Suite 100
Raleigh, NC 27617-3390
(919) 816-3720 • FAX (919) 816-4275 • doglaw@akc.org



AMERICAN
KENNEL CLUB®

May 11, 2016 (5:30pm) Cedar City Council Meeting

Hard copies distributed for record to: Cedar City Corporation Staff and City Council Members

Re: Animal Ordinance Proposals / May 4, 2016 Cedar City Council Work Mtg

Mon, May 9, 2016 2:34 pm

From K3schwan k3schwan@aol.com

To paul@cozzenscabinets.com, mayorwilson@cedarcity.org, adams@cedarcity.org,
paulcedarcitycouncil@gmail.com, zonafeller@gmail.com, terrihartley@outlook.com,
isom@suu.edu, hrick@cedarcity.org, paulb@cedarcity.org, wkit@cedarcity.org,
norris@cedarcity.org, bwendy@cedarcity.org, srenon@cedarcity.org, abob@cedarcity.org,
mkeith@cedarcity.org, adarin@cedarcity.org
Cc bburkitt@thespectrum.com, tsullivan@stgnews.com, ccac@accesswest.com,
jfox@utahhumane.org

Paul (Cozzens),

I received your conclusions in response to my 5/6/16 email, supporting the focus on irresponsible owners instead of limiting numbers. Thanks for sending and for your support.

Over this past weekend, I have been receiving, reading comments, and learning about supportive emails, Facebook postings, and polls throughout the community -- and the overwhelming result is that residents DO support an amendment to the ordinance regarding changing the limit of dogs. When attending public City Council meetings, or reading about them the very next day in the news, we, the community, expect and deserve to hear all of the facts presented by the City and elected officials without bias or misrepresentations. Perhaps this is an issue to take to the voting booth and let the people decide.

Just as the AKC opposes animal limit laws (and not the AKC-registration aspect), what is opposed and NOT supported by the community is the additional proposed "condition" that would require ALL three pets to be AKC-registered dogs. By removing this condition, which isn't complex or difficult, it would allow responsible and caring pet owners to rescue and adopt a third shelter dog or cat from an isolated, anti-social "kennel environment" at the Cedar City Animal Shelter and into their loving, forever-family homes. It would also allow responsible residents to own and care for three AKC-registered dogs as a part of their families, if they so choose.

Note: Sources of the media comments and Facebook polls are:

- Cedar/Enoch Pets Blog
- What's Happening in Cedar City and Iron County
- Life in Cedar City and Iron County
- Iron County News, Issues and Current Events
- Cedar City Animal Control (Shelter) Facebook
- St. George News
- The Spectrum

Conclusions #1 and #2

Regarding people already having more than two dogs and not knowing there is a limit, this is absolutely true. Before moving here from out-of-state, I researched this area, including in great depth, Cedar City's website (cedarcity.org). Personally, had I known there was an animal limit, I would have seriously reconsidered the move. Perhaps Cedar City Real Estate agents should begin to inform prospective local and out-of-state buyers about this city-specific ordinance (or perhaps there is concern that it would deter people from purchasing homes and property here). Our ERA RE agent did not advise us of this ordinance, nor is this information available on their RE website.

Currently, the one and only sentence that describes Cedar City's animal/pet limit restrictions can be found buried in the City's Corporate website ... First, you'd have to know to look under "Your Government" -- "City Ordinances" -- then Chapter 11/Animal Control -- under Article IV, Regulatory Permits and Licenses -- and finally, under Section 11-IV-2, **Kennel Permits**. Yes, there it is, under Kennel Permits. This sentence also references, by title only, Chapter 26, Cedar City Ordinance (which has 16 separate sub-Articles attached to it).

Proposed solutions: Educate the public community, including residents, visitors, tourists, students, and people considering a re-location or move to Cedar City, about the City's animal/pet limit restrictions. If Cedar City is having such issues with enforcement of this animal limit language in Ordinance/Chapter 11, perhaps informing the public that it even exists would be a start.

- On Cedar City's Corporate website, from the Home Page, under "Our Community," there are two (2) separate links: "Moving to Cedar City" and "New Resident/Student Information." These two webpages, plus the Cedar City Animal Control (Shelter) webpage (and Facebook pages), would be excellent locations to publicize Cedar City's animal limit laws, which would discourage those who oppose such limits from moving here.
- Also, add wording to include and identify Animal/Pet Limit Restrictions to the current "Brief Description" of Chapter 11/Animal Control on the City's Ordinance webpage: <http://www.cedarcity.org/6/Ordinances>
Conclusion #3 (lack of resources or time to fully enforce the current ordinance):

This issue is in the hands of the City's Budget review and allocation process.

Animal Control did submit for 2015/16 budget consideration in the document "FY 2015/2016 Budget Personnel Requests" the following:

- Re-classification of two (2) Animal Control Officer positions (from 7 to 9, upgraded to same classification as Code Enforcement Officers); Code Enforcement could assist Animal Control
 - Animal Control Officer II (vacant)
 - Shelter Assistant position (upgrade from part-time, 25 hrs, to full-time, 40 hrs).
- Conclusions #4, #5, and #6**

Lastly, with regard to strengthening the ordinance and then doing a better job of enforcing it?

- The ordinance as currently written is already enforceable.

Proposed Solutions:

Several recent cases of horrendous animal neglect and abuse in this area over the past recent years have resulted with the animals losing their lives while their human violators get barely a slap on the wrist.

- What needs to be "beefed up" is strong enforcement of the current laws to penalize irresponsible, neglectful, and abusive human violators, and not the animals. Pets and animals at the mercy of inhumane animal owners have already suffered enough or have been killed or euthanized.
- Arrest, charge, fine, jail the abusers of the animal cruelty laws (and not just part-time jail on the weekends); recommend and impose court-ordered community service.
- Stronger deterrents must be used against neglectful human violators to discourage despicable animal neglect and abuse. Those who are caught, including even misguided juveniles, are rarely charged, let alone punished to the **fullest** extent permitted by **law**.
- Introduce a public education program in local schools, especially in the early grades, and communities to demonstrate and encourage humane and compassionate care of animals.
- A community dog park would provide a valuable environment for kids and adults to interact together with animals.
- Consider and accept a community-based TNR (Trap-Neuter-Release) effort to successfully alter and control the kitty and cat populations on the streets and in shelters.

- Consider and accept the generous and willing offers of residents and non-profit organizations to provide community assistance with local animal welfare projects, volunteers, and fundraising efforts to provide necessary items and services at Cedar City's Animal Shelter. The community can help ease the City's workload.

It is not a "hardship" for me or other responsible animal owners to open our homes to add one more dog or cat to our families, to love and care for them. They are not disposable. You don't just "get rid of" a lovable family member.

Kathy Kaminski
586-438-9124

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Cozzens <paul@cozzenscabinets.com>

To: K3schwan <k3schwan@aol.com>; mayorwilson@cedarcity.org; adams@cedarcity.org; paulcedarcitycouncil@gmail.com>; zonafeller@gmail.com>; terrihartley@outlook.com>; <isom@suu.edu>; <hrick@cedarcity.org>; <paulb@cedarcity.org>; <wkit@cedarcity.org>; <norris@cedarcity.org>; <bwendy@cedarcity.org>; <srenon@cedarcity.org>; <abob@cedarcity.org>; <mkeith@cedarcity.org>; <adarin@cedarcity.org>

Cc: <bburkitt@thespectrum.com>; <tsullivan@stgnews.com>; <ccac@accesswest.com>; <jfox@utahhumane.org>

Sent: Fri, May 6, 2016 1:32 pm

Subject: RE: Animal Ordinance Proposals / May 4, 2016 Cedar City Council Work Mtg

Kathy,

Your input is appreciated, after visiting with many residents, looking into, and researching this for a couple of weeks this is what I have concluded;

- 1-Those that want more than two dogs already have them.
- 2- Many don't even realize there is a limit on the number of dogs.
- 3- We don't have the resources or time to fully enforce this ordinance.
- 4- We need to beef up our nuisance ordinance to control the problems of irresponsible owners instead of limiting numbers. This hasn't worked as evidenced in what is already happening.
- 5- Trying to change an ordinance that isn't working anyway and trying to limit Mr. Isom (Who is very responsible) when we don't enforce hundreds of owners that are out of compliance is pointless.
- 6- Again, If we change the ordinance it needs to focus on the nuisance side instead of numbers.

Thanks,

Paul Cozzens

City Council

Cedar City, Ut. 84721

435-586-7618 Shop

435-590-7618 Cell

435-586-7630 Fax

paul@cozzenscabinets.com

From: K3schwan [mailto:k3schwan@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, May 6, 2016 12:59 PM

To: mayorwilson@cedarcity.org; adams@cedarcity.org; paulcedarcitycouncil@gmail.com; zonafeller@gmail.com; terrihartley@outlook.com; isom@suu.edu; hrick@cedarcity.org; paulb@cedarcity.org; wkit@cedarcity.org; norris@cedarcity.org; bwendy@cedarcity.org; srenon@cedarcity.org; abob@cedarcity.org; mkeith@cedarcity.org; adarin@cedarcity.org

Cc: bburkitt@thespectrum.com; tsullivan@stgnews.com; ccac@accesswest.com; jfox@utahhumane.org

Subject: Animal Ordinance Proposals / May 4, 2016 Cedar City Council Work Mtg

This email is in response to the May 4, 2016 City Council Work Meeting (Business Agenda/Public, Item #2, Consider amendments to the Animal Control Ordinance).

Mayor Wilson referred to a letter she had received from the American Kennel Club (AKC) concerning one of the proposed amendments to the current Animal Control Ordinance. This proposal (one of two being considered) would allow raising the number of dogs per residence from two (2) to three (3), as long as all three dogs are AKC registered.

At the May 4th meeting, which I attended, the Mayor referenced the AKC letter she had received stating the AKC "objected" to the idea that an ordinance would require dogs, in this case three, to be AKC-registered in order for residents to be able to have more dogs. Further, that it was found to be interesting that the AKC did not like such criteria. Councilmember Paul Cozzens, indicating he also read the same AKC letter, responded with a comment that the AKC's issue and non-support of the proposal is because the AKC does not support the limit of the number of dogs per residence.

In support of the AKC's position on this very subject, attached is a copy of the AKC's "Animal Limit Law: Better Alternatives" document (also available online at: <http://images.akc.org/pdf/GLEG02.pdf>). I read the entire document and have summarized relevant information.

- The AKC opposes unreasonable limitations on pet ownership. To be a bit more transparent, it is the use of "Animal Limit Laws" that the AKC opposes, not the 3-dog AKC registration requirement.
- Limit laws target ALL owners, including the many (majority) responsible dog owners.
- Limit laws often force caring, responsible owners to surrender their above limit animals to shelters that are already overcrowded. Responsible owners love their animals; they are part of the family.
- Homeless, abandoned animals in Cedar City's Animal Shelter could be adopted by a current two-dog responsible, caring animal owner.
- Limiting the number of dogs an individual may own is an ineffective solution to animal control problems because it fails to address the heart of the issue -- irresponsible ownership.
- Therefore, the AKC also strongly supports public education initiatives to help teach community residents how to properly care for and interact with pets, along with the need to be a courteous neighbor.

Studies have proven there is NO direct link between a specific number of dogs and the amount of nuisance they create ... one poorly trained dog can cause more problems than four well-behaved dogs. Limit laws are discriminatory against responsible pet owners/residents. Public education campaigns teaching responsible dog ownership, a community dog park, could definitely improve the situation and resolve concerns.

There are many volunteers and non-profit animal organizations SO willing to actively participate in animal support efforts in this community. Many cities in Utah have already experienced successful progress with their efforts to respond to their residents. Community government is also designed ... by the people, for the people. Please accept our offers and consider working with the actual community, including the many responsible dog owners, to find shared, workable, and enforceable solutions. We can all accomplish this together.

Kathy Kaminski
586-438-9124

ANIMAL LIMIT LAWS: BETTER ALTERNATIVES



THE AKC'S POSITION STATEMENT ON THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND ENJOY DOGS

The human-canine bond predates history. Since the dawn of civilization, people have enjoyed the companionship and assistance of dogs. Dog ownership has existed in all cultures, races, climates and economic situations — by monarchs, monks, nomads and peasants.

The American Kennel Club® strongly endorses the right to own, keep and breed dogs in a responsible and humane manner. We believe that responsible dog ownership is compatible with most living arrangements. The AKC® opposes unreasonable limitations on pet ownership, such as the prohibition of dogs for residents of senior citizen and government-subsidized housing facilities.

The American Kennel Club recognizes the special obligation of dog owners, not only to their pets but also to their neighbors. The AKC supports “curbing” and clean-up ordinances, leash laws, nuisance laws, and other reasonable regulations designed to ensure that dogs and their owners remain respected members of their communities.

WHAT IS A “LIMIT LAW?”

A limit law is a restriction on the number of animals an individual or household may own. These laws are usually passed on the city or county level and vary greatly from one community to the next. Sometimes limit laws stem from one problem owner who lets his or her dogs run loose or allows them to bark incessantly. Other times a string of incidents caused by irresponsible dog owners is the spark. Whatever the impetus, many communities often look to a quick fix — limiting the number of dogs allowed per household.

This trend presents a wealth of problems for the purebred dog fancy. Worse, though, are the problems limit laws cause the communities that propose them. Limit laws are introduced as a cure-all for animal control problems, but in reality they are typically unsuccessful and often create more problems than they solve.

But what makes limit laws so ineffective, and how can purebred dog owners and legislators help alleviate the problems that often lead to their introduction? What are some alternative solutions to the very legitimate animal control problems many communities face? The following are some important points to keep in mind when dealing with this issue.

LIMIT LAWS ARE NOT THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY TO SOLVE ANIMAL CONTROL PROBLEMS.

- Limiting the number of dogs an individual may own is an ineffective solution to animal control problems because it fails to address the heart of the issue — irresponsible ownership. Whether they own five dogs or two, irresponsible owners will still allow their animals to run loose, leave their mess in a neighbor's yard, or bark long into the night.
- Limit laws are extremely difficult to enforce and can be evaded by irresponsible animal owners. For example, individuals may choose not to license their pets as a way to avoid regulation. Animal control officers therefore have no way of knowing how many pets an owner has unless they make regular door-to-door inspections. To do so would be an expensive, time-consuming process that in many cases would require a search warrant. Fewer licenses also means less revenue for city government.
- Limit laws often force caring, responsible owners to surrender their excess animals to shelters that are already overcrowded, thereby increasing a city's shelter population problems and euthanasia rates.
- Hoping to evade limit laws, people may try to hide the number of dogs they own. To do so, owners avoid taking their animals to veterinarians and getting needed vaccinations. This may affect rabies prevention and threaten public safety. It also jeopardizes animals' health.
- In many cases, communities already have nuisance laws in place that, if properly enforced, could reduce animal control problems. Passing new laws is a lengthy, expensive process that only burdens public officials and taxpayers without resolving the issue at hand.

LIMIT PROPOSALS ARE UNFAIR TO RESPONSIBLE DOG OWNERS AND BREEDERS.

- Limit laws target all owners, regardless of their actions or the behavior of their animals. Responsible owners should be allowed to use their discretion in determining the number of dogs they can keep on their own property.
- A limit on the number of dogs one can own would restrict the many responsible breeders who raise and breed purebred dogs for the purpose of showing. These breeders make a serious commitment to their animals, not to make a huge profit, but instead to improve the individual breeds.
- Limit laws would impact the many responsible fanciers who rescue unwanted animals and either personally adopt them as pets or find them permanent homes.

BETTER SOLUTIONS ARE AVAILABLE.

- Strongly enforced animal control laws, nuisance regulations requirements for pet owners to be respectful of neighbors and society, and increased public education efforts are all better ways to address the issue of irresponsible dog ownership.
- Effective leash and curbing laws can prevent irresponsible owners from letting their pets run loose, possibly endangering the public and other animals.
- Clean-up ordinances, as well as noise, odor, and nuisance regulations, can require all pet owners to take responsibility for their animals and recognize their obligations to society.
- For those who do violate nuisance laws, alternative sentencing in the form of community service at an animal shelter or participation in obedience or Canine Good Citizen classes may help correct irresponsible behavior.
- Use of an arbitrator to mediate neighborhood animal disputes can help settle personal arguments that are not indicative of an animal control problem.
- Public education initiatives to help teach community residents how to properly care for and interact with pets, as well as the need to be a courteous neighbor can have a positive impact.

THE PUREBRED DOG FANCY AND THE AMERICAN KENNEL CLUB ARE VALUABLE RESOURCES.

- The AKC and its local dog clubs are committed to ensuring that effective animal control laws are fair, effective and promote responsible dog ownership. To help achieve these goals, dog fanciers often assist the community by serving on or starting animal control advisory boards to monitor animal related problems and develop reasonable solutions. Many volunteer their time and resources to help start or improve public education campaigns to teach responsible dog ownership.

- The AKC's Government Relations and Public Education Departments also support communities in many ways. The Government Relations Department (919-816-3720, doglaw@akc.org) can provide sample legislation and help improve animal control laws. The Public Education Department offers free materials to schools, dog clubs, shelters and community organizations to help educate the public about responsible dog ownership (Contact the AKC's Customer Service Department at 919-233-9767 for more information). More information is also available online at www.akc.org.

Legislators and responsible dog owners have a shared interest in making sure that neighborhoods remain safe, enjoyable places for both people and dogs. By working together, government officials and the public can find workable, enforceable solutions to animal control problems without resorting to limit laws.

**For more information, contact the
AKC Government Relations Department:
Phone: (919) 816-3720
E-mail: doglaw@akc.org
www.akc.org**



More taxes, fees, permitted dogs may come out of City Council meeting

Written by Tracie Sullivan - May 10, 2016

CEDAR CITY –Higher taxes, increased fees, bigger salaries and more dogs; these are all issues Cedar City Council is slated to vote on Wednesday.

The regularly scheduled meeting at 5:30 p.m. has a packed agenda for the council to tackle.

Of highest priority are the proposed changes to the city's dog ordinance that has remained a discussion item for three weeks.

During that time, many conversations swarmed social media and generated controversy from the public at large. The topic even caught national attention from an online publication specifically geared to dog enthusiasts that censured council members for comments made during one of their meetings.

At issue is whether the council should allow residents to own three dogs or continue to limit ownership to the two currently permitted under the city's ordinance.

Initially, the council discussed restricting ownership of three dogs to animals registered with the American and United kennel clubs.

However, the idea drew criticism from various sources including the AKC. The organization sent two email letters to Mayor Maile Wilson opining on the limitation of dog ownership – regardless of breed or registration.

"The American Kennel Club [AKC] suggests rescinding the limit ordinance entirely, allowing your animal control officers to focus on enforcing quality of life ordinances such as nuisance, noise and sanitation. Limit laws do not work and are a burden to responsible owners who are not causing trouble in their neighborhoods," the letter stated. "It is not necessary to limit residents to AKC or UKC registered animals, as the rescue group pointed out. The more limitations you create, the more work it will be for your animal control officers to enforce."

Animal Control: Jason – we are identifying \$2,400 the shelter does sterilizations, we take deposits, and those funds have to be used for sterilizations by law. Chief also asked for reclass of the two positions, we did not fund those. Chief – the Animal Control Officers (ACO) are grade 7, Code Enforcement are grade 9, if they were the same I could use all four to cross train to do code enforcement. Right now I don't have the ACO I filled because they don't have the experience, they have to be there 2 years. Rowley – have we talked about sharing with the County? Chief – the shelter is 50 years old, we have 800 square feet for dogs, 21 cages, 140+ feet for cats and they are stacked on each other. We have to keep animals for minimum 5 days. When we get above the numbers we have to euthanize, we try to get them claimed. We will always be a kill shelter because we don't have the space. We have put together ideas for shelter to operate and give some growth. I sent Lt. Millett to several shelters to see size, projected to grow. He drew up the plans and then gave it to the Engineers office to do plans. We had a meeting with the Enoch and the County to look at combining, and the County was not interested. Enoch was interested about further discussion. The County wanted to have the option at a future date to expand on ours. Rowley – all the things in the world for donations, a new shelter would be one place to receive private donations. Cozzens – we need to be careful on the costs. Chief - \$140 a square foot includes impact fees; it may be a little high. We are going off Larry Palmer's numbers and the last Fire Station. Black – have you looked at locations? Chief – with Enoch they liked the old sewer plant property. You could have a shelter and a dog park together and you could get more volunteers. We would have to look at the costs. We need 4,000 square feet, we don't have the space to take a dog out and clean. Rowley – how does the no kill shelter work, does every animal get adopted? Chief – it doesn't, they are kill shelters but they claim they only kill those that are not adoptable. A lot they will send to other agencies like Best Friends. Black – I would like to look at upgrading at least one of the Animal Control Officers. Cozzens – if we cross train can we get better things done? Chief – I don't actively enforce some of the animal control violations, if we did everything we should as well as with code enforcement, we could do a lot more for the City. Code Enforcement had 247 written cases last year and Animal Control had 290, those are just the ones with documentation, which is pretty busy, I think the Code Enforcement could do more. We impounded over 4,000 animals last year. Cozzens – why does Code Enforcement not help animal control more? Chief – my Code Enforcement guys claim to be busy, I look at numbers, and I know they could do more.

Doug Hall – I think this is a good opportunity to make an observation. If you look in the budget, under revenue you see dog and cat licenses and it is \$2,000 collecting. I would look at that being a means to fund animal control. We have such a minuscule amount that we could enforce and cover animal control costs. We should take a hard look at that and require people to get dog and cat licenses. Rowley – also make sure they are sterilized. Doug – there are different fees for sterilized animals. Marchant – how do you find out if you don't have someone to do that? Doug Hall – I don't think people know they need a dog or cat license. Marchant – I think they don't care. Doug – then do away with the animal control ordinance. Chief – it is enforced with the barking dog, they get a warning and then enforce. We don't have time to go door to door.

5/11/2016: CC MTG

SPECIAL COUNCIL WORK MINUTES
MAY 13, 2014

The City Council held a work meeting on Tuesday, May 13, 2014, at 1:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 10 North Main Street, Cedar City, Utah.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Maile Wilson; Councilmembers: Ron Adams; John Black; Paul Cozzens; Fred Rowley; Don Marchant.

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Rick Holman; City Attorney Paul Bittmenn; City Engineer Kit Wareham; City Recorder Renon Savage; Finance Director Jason Norris; Police Chief Robert D. Allinson; Fire Chief Paul Irons; Leisure Services Director Dan Rodgeron; Economic Development Director Brennan Wood; Events Coordinator Byron Linford; Parks Superintendent Wally Davis; Recreation Coordinator Marlene Kay; Golf Pro Jared Barnes; Aquatic Center Chris Hudson; Cross Hollows Larry Olds; HR Director Natasha Hirschi; Executive Assistant Ruth Sessions.

OTHERS PRESENT: Doug Hall

CALL TO ORDER: Councilmember Rowley gave the opening prayer; the pledge of allegiance was led by Doug Hall.

BUDGET:

Economic Development: Jason – we will talk Economic Development in the general fund and Brennan administers the RDA fund as well. In the Economic Development budget there is a \$13,000 increase for economic incentives they are collected from other entities, this is for Genpak which is estimated off \$1,000 per job. The RDA. Paul – you need to convene the RDA if you are to discuss its budget. If it bleeds into the Council budget you can talk about it, but you will need to notice the meeting. If it impacts the City budget you can talk about it. Jason – brief overview of the fund without decisions. We have added tax incentives for events over the past year. In relation to other discussions there are requests as far as street lights as talked yesterday; signage on the interchange. We can talk in more detail when we have a meeting. Rowley – how far does the region run? Paul – the old project area? Yes. We need to separate the old from today. In the 80's the first project ran South to North interchange and 200 North to the Crystal Inn, 500+ acres. After we did that the Legislature said you cannot have a massive project area, it has to be less than 100 acres, so it was the downtown area, but we were grandfathered in. We have a few areas now, GAF, Port 15, MSC Aerospace and maybe a few others. Rowley – Jason mentioned the street light project, is that in an area? Paul – no, the funds to do that are to come out of Lin's revenue and it is not restricted.

Capital requests – Brennan – the north and south interchange billboards are a challenge to maintain, the neon lights break and the lettering cracks. We have been spending \$4,000 a year to maintain. Mayor Burgess and Nina pushed for the south interchange billboard to be redone. It would not be backlit, front lit taking away the maintenance, we are now

Source: <http://www.cedarcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/9394>

[Home](#) > [Your Government](#) > [Departments](#) > [Finance](#) > [Budgets](#)

Budgets

Fiscal Year Budgets

- [FY 15/16 Budget](#)
- [FY 14/15 Budget](#)
- [FY 13/14 Budget](#)
- [FY 12/13 Budget](#)
- [FY 11/12 Budget](#)
- [FY 10/11 Budget](#)

Audited Financial Statements

- [FY 2011](#)
- [FY 2012](#)
- [FY 2013](#)
- [FY 2014](#)

Selected: [FY 15/16/Budget Link](#) (result and source below)

Source: <http://www.cedarcity.org/DocumentCenter/View/9394>

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION FY 2015-16 PERSONNEL REQUESTS

Priority	Department/Description	Grade	Salary	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Capital Outlay	Total	Approved
ADMINISTRATION							
1	Hourly Utility Billing Clerk	10/hour	\$ 10,400	\$ 586	\$ -	\$ 11,286	\$ -
POLICE							
1	Detective	13	40,189	28,647	38,095	106,931	106,931
2	Incentive Pay for Specialized/Advanced Skills and Assignments	NA	45,552	21,104	-	66,656	-
3	College / Bilingual Incentives	NA	50,544	23,417	-	73,961	-
4	School Resource Officer	12	38,059	27,876	60,362	126,297	-
5	Patrol Officer	11	36,045	27,147	60,362	123,554	-
6	Information Tech. / Neighborhood Preservation Officer	12	38,059	27,876	38,916	104,851	-
7	Narcotics Officer	12	38,059	27,876	38,916	104,851	-
8	Traffic Officer	12	38,059	27,876	60,362	126,297	-
9	Salary Adjustments for Police Officers (all city employees)		-	-	-	-	-
FIRE							
1	Fire Engineer (reclass 3 positions)	10-13	15,606	4,927	-	20,533	-
BUILDING DEPARTMENT							
1	Administrative Assistant	8	30,639	21,993	-	52,632	12,000
ANIMAL CONTROL							
1	Animal Control Officer I (reclass 2 positions)	7-9	5,025	1,655	-	7,580	-
2	Animal Control Officer II vacant	8-10	-	-	-	-	-
3	Shelter Assistant (25 hours to 40 hours)	4	8,782	16,531	-	25,313	-

5/11/2016: CC Mtg

